

英語 - I

次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[31]から[40]の空所を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を1から3の中から選び、その番号を解答欄(31)から(40)にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[41]から[45]の設問には、1から4の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄(41)から(45)にマークしなさい。

- 1 A recent report from the U.K. suggested that the country eliminate speed bumps from its roads to ease vehicle passage and limit carbon emissions. This has since given rise to heated debate. In the U.S., homeowners often push for more speed bumps in their neighborhoods to slow drivers, making local routes for deliveries more [31](1. cumbersome 2. scenic 3. overbearing) each year. But – from the point of view of an economist – are these bumps actually a good idea?

- 2 On one hand, the bumps slow down traffic, and that probably saves some lives. Yet the calculus is not so simple, in part because speed bumps bring unintended secondhand consequences. Many cars or trucks [32](1. swipe 2. swap 3. swerve) around them, which is arguably more dangerous than having no obstacle in the first place, or drivers may rev up their engines to accelerate once the bump is past. The constant “bump bump” noises or screeching brakes have led many nearby homeowners to request that the bumps be removed. The bumps may drive too much traffic to alternate routes, and they slow down the response of emergency vehicles.

- 3 Traffic obstacles [33](1. also 2. still 3. instead) raise the cost of deliveries sent to our homes, such as by UPS or FedEx truck. The result may be more individual trips to retail stores, which may boost the number of accidents and deaths. Don’t assume that apparent safety precautions always means more safety, as economic inefficiencies bring their own dangers, even if they are less visible.

- 4 One way to systematically evaluate speed bumps would be to look at home values in streets with and without the bumps, as you might [34](1. contemplate 2. think 3. ponder) that safer homes would sell for more. But one study – with imperfect controls – found no difference in real estate values, so that doesn’t settle the question.

- 5 Another economic approach would consider whether the private sector, when trying to accommodate customer demand, finds that speed bumps help or hurt business. That’s a kind of market test of the concept, and indeed I often see speed bumps in shopping mall parking lots, to slow down traffic and ease the risk of accidents, including to pedestrians. The mall and parking lot owners have decided that the benefits of greater safety will attract more customers than the inconveniences of driving more slowly, and other possible costs, will put customers [35](1. off 2. on 3. up). That is a seat-of-the-pants cost-benefit test, and it suggests some role for the bumps in the broader world.

6 That said, my personal impression is that these private-sector speed bumps are smoother and gentler than the ones I often find in neighborhoods. When it comes to local roads, the residents are actively trying to keep outside drivers away, [36](1. whereas 2. hence 3. thereby) the shopping mall and parking lot owners seek the best overall environment for commercial reasons. As a tentative conclusion, I think some speed bumps are a good idea, but many are too [37](1. obsessive 2. obstructive 3. obsolete) and perhaps they are too numerous as well; this view is supported by some recent research. Another angle of the speed bumps debate is how much it revolves around issues of symbolic value, and that in part explains why the discussion can become so heated.

7 By its very design, a speed bump is a deliberate obstacle with maximum transparency as such. It is sending a message that the social goals of safety or neighborhood quiet are sufficiently important that it is worth slowing people’s progress when they travel. There are many regulations that try to make our lives safer, but most of them are hidden, with nontransparent costs, such as auto-safety regulations as applied through crash tests. A speed bump, [38](1. similarly 2. by extension 3. in contrast), can work only if people notice it each time. So to the extent a society accepts speed bumps, it is visibly advertising the notion that limits to fast transportation – a symbol of progress – are acceptable in the name of safety and cozy locality.

8 You might be wondering why, in such a high-tech era, we need speed bumps at all. Why not use cameras or sensors to detect and [39](1. defer 2. deter 3 deny) speeders and other irresponsible drivers? There are at least two reasons: greater expense and privacy. Many people in a neighborhood don’t want there to be an electronic [40](1. record 2. album 3. memento) of their comings and goings, and thus they are willing to embrace what is essentially Stone Age technology.

9 In sum, one side of the speed bumps debate feels it is up against enemies of smooth transport and progress, while the other is seeking to protect privacy and comfortable communities.

10 Since both progress and privacy are in such scarce supply these days, is it any wonder that everyone goes away unhappy?

—Based on Cowen, T. (2017). “Caution: Debate over speed bumps ahead,” *Bloomberg*.

[41] What is true according to the article?

1. The author suggests that speed bumps should be removed from America.
2. British citizens often push for more residential speed bumps.
3. Dangerous delays for ambulances and firetrucks may be caused by speed bumps.
4. Installing speed bumps may cause privacy and environmental issues.

[42] In the 5th paragraph, what is specifically meant by “a market test of the concept”?

1. It may be possible to measure the economic impact of speed bumps by researching the market value of houses in areas containing them, versus areas that don't.
2. Speed bumps would be removed from business areas if they hurt profits too much, so by the very fact that they remain, they can be seen to have value.
3. After extensive surveying, it is evident that most Americans want speed bumps more than their British counterparts.
4. It is a large-scale project that explores the use and non-use of speed bumps in supermarket parking lots throughout the UK and America.

[43] In the 5th and 6th paragraphs, what is a key difference between residential and private-sector speed bumps?

1. Residential speed bumps are smoother to protect the cars of the nearby homeowners.
2. Commercial area speed bumps are meant to be welcoming and residential unwelcoming.
3. Delivery companies such as UPS and FedEx prefer residential speed bumps.
4. Commercial speed bumps tend to be much higher and much noisier.

[44] Which of the following is implied as an issue associated with speed bumps?

1. Less efficient security cameras are being replaced by speed bumps.
2. Speed bumps must be noticed and abided by in order to be effective.
3. Speed bumps could lead to more competition among delivery companies like FedEx.
4. The safety of speed bumps is not worth the inconvenience to mall owners.

[45] In the 10th paragraph, why does the author conclude “is it any wonder that everyone goes away unhappy?”

1. Reconciling differences on issues of safety, economics, and privacy is difficult.
2. Speed bumps are such a hassle around homes and businesses that people are left dissatisfied.
3. America and the UK cannot agree on speed bump policy, so all concerned parties are left discontent.
4. Businesses and individuals are “bumping heads” due to drastically opposing opinions.

英語 - II

次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[46]から[55]の空所を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を1から3の中から選び、その番号を解答欄 (46) から (55) にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[56]から[60]の設問には、1から4の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄 (56) から (60) にマークしなさい。

- 1 Would you advise someone to wave towels in a burning house? To bring a flyswatter to a gunfight? Yet the counsel we hear on climate change could scarcely be more out of sync with the nature of the crisis. The email in my inbox last week offered thirty suggestions to green my office space: use reusable pens, redecorate with light colors, stop using the elevator. Back at home, done climbing stairs, I could get on with other [46](1. opinions 2. options 3. opposition): change my lightbulbs, buy local veggies, purchase eco-appliances, put a solar panel on my roof. And a study released on Thursday claimed it had figured out the single best way to fight climate change: I could [47](1. swear off 2. advise against 3. allow for) ever having a child.
- 2 These pervasive exhortations to individual action — in corporate ads, school textbooks, and the campaigns of mainstream environmental groups, especially in the west — seem as natural as the air we breathe. But we could hardly be worse-served.
- 3 While we busy ourselves greening our personal lives, fossil fuel corporations are rendering these efforts [48](1. impertinent 2. irrelevant 3. inaccessible). The breakdown of carbon emissions since 1988? A hundred companies alone are responsible for an astonishing 71%. You tinker with those pens or that panel; they go on torching the planet. The freedom of these corporations to pollute – and the fixation on a feeble lifestyle response – is no [49](1. accident 2. incident 3. intent). It is the result of an ideological war, waged over the last 40 years, against the possibility of collective action. Devastatingly successful, it is not too late to reverse it.
- 4 The political project of neoliberalism has pursued two principal objectives. The first has been to [50](1. distrust 2. disenfranchise 3. dismantle) any barriers to the exercise of unaccountable private power. The second has been to erect them to the exercise of any democratic public will.
- 5 Its trademark policies are that [51](1. to 2. for 3. of) privatization, deregulation, tax cuts, and free trade deals. These have liberated corporations to accumulate enormous profits and treat the atmosphere like a sewage dump, and hamstrung our ability as individuals to plan for our collective welfare.
- 6 Anything resembling a collective [52](1. check 2. break 3. run) on corporate power has become a target of the elite. At the very moment when climate change demands an unprecedented collective

public response, neoliberal ideology stands in the way. Which is why, if we want to bring down emissions fast, we will need to overcome all of its free-market mantras: take railways and utilities and energy grids back into public control; regulate corporations to phase out fossil fuels; and raise taxes to pay for massive investment in climate-ready infrastructure and renewable energy — [53](1. so 2. but 3. with) that solar panels can go on everyone’s rooftop, not just on those who can afford it.

7 Studies show that people who have grown up under this era have indeed become more individualistic and consumerist. Steeped in a culture telling us to think of ourselves as consumers instead of citizens, as self-reliant instead of interdependent, is it any wonder we deal with a systemic issue by turning in droves to ineffectual, individual efforts?

8 Of course we need people to consume less and innovate low-carbon alternatives – build sustainable farms, invent new batteries, spread zero-waste methods. But individual choices will most count when the economic system can provide viable, environmental options for everyone — not just an affluent or intrepid few.

9 If affordable mass transit isn’t available, people will commute with cars. If local organic food is too expensive, they won’t opt out of fossil fuel-intensive super-market chains. If cheap mass produced goods flow endlessly, they will buy and buy and buy. This is the deception of neoliberalism: to persuade us to address climate change through our pocket-books, rather than through power and politics.

10 Eco-consumerism may [54](1. expire 2. expiate 3. exterminate) your guilt. But it’s only mass movements that have the power to alter the trajectory of the climate crisis. This requires of us first a resolute mental break from the spell cast by neoliberalism: to stop thinking like individuals.

11 The good news is that the impulse of humans to come together is inextinguishable – and the collective imagination is already making a political come-back. The climate justice movement is blocking pipelines, forcing the divestment of trillions of dollars, and winning support for 100% clean energy economies in cities and states across the world. New ties are being made to Black Lives Matter, immigrant and indigenous rights, and fights for better wages. On the [55](1. heels 2. haunches 3. hairs) of such movements, political parties seem finally ready to defy neoliberal dogma.

12 So grow some carrots and jump on a bike: it will make you happier and healthier. But it is time to stop obsessing with how personally green we live – and start collectively taking on corporate power.

—Based on Lukacs, M. (2017). *The Guardian*.

[56] In the 1st paragraph, why does the author mention a gunfight?

1. The battle against neoliberalism is so heated that it has inspired violent metaphors.
2. It is an assertion that climate change is now at a fight-to-the-death stage.
3. To emphasize the inadequacy of current policies and strategies to fight climate change.
4. As an analogy between the speed and danger of misleading e-mails and bullets.

[57] In the 5th paragraph, what does the article claim is being “hamstrung”?

1. Promotion of effective individual action for the cause of saving the environment.
2. Regulation prohibiting corporations from having the resources to fight climate change.
3. Devastation of the environment by people who do not take personal responsibility.
4. Incapacitation of group action by diverting all focus to relatively minor individual action.

[58] In the 6th paragraph, what best exemplifies a “free-market mantra”?

1. Claims that free markets are harmful and should be replaced with publicly owned utilities.
2. The belief by the markets that environmental protection will make them free.
3. The assertion that free-market policies will improve services like transportation.
4. The idea that free power sources, such as solar, wind, and water, will save the planet.

[59] Which of the following is ***NOT*** true according to the article?

1. Less than a dozen companies release most of the greenhouse gases released into the air.
2. Neoliberalism makes people feel like they are doing something more important than they are.
3. Putting utilities such as power companies and trains in private hands is problematic.
4. Black Lives Matter is a hopeful example of the resurgence of collective action to fight problems.

[60] Which of the following would be the best title for this article?

1. Individual Responsibility is Key to Environmental Change
2. The Con Job of Neoliberalism
3. Neoliberalism Breaks Down Walls to Collective Action
4. The 30 Ways to Green Your Life and Save the Planet

英語 - III

次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[61]から[80]の空所を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を1から3の中から選び、その番号を解答欄(61)から(80)にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[81]から[90]の設問には、1から4の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄(81)から(90)にマークしなさい。

- 1 The rulings on online speech are coming down all over the world. Most recently, on June 30, Germany passed a law that orders social media companies operating in the country to delete hate speech within 24 hours of it being posted, or face fines of up to \$57 million per instance. In May, a court in Austria ruled that Facebook must take down specific posts that were considered hateful toward the country's Green party leader. Each of those rulings [61](1. assumed 2. mandated 3. permitted) that companies remove the content not just in the countries where it was posted, but globally. Currently, in France, the country's privacy regulator is fighting Google in the courts to get the tech giant to apply Europe's "right to be forgotten" laws worldwide. And, around the world, dozens of similar cases are [62](1. impossible 2. unlikely 3. pending).
- 2 The trend of courts applying country-specific social media laws worldwide could radically change what is allowed to be on the Internet, setting a troubling [63](1. precedent 2. limit 3. goal). What happens to the global Internet when countries with different cultures have sharply diverging definitions of what is acceptable online speech? What happens when one country's idea of acceptable speech clashes with another's idea of hate speech? Experts worry the biggest risk is that the whole Internet will be forced to [64](1. contort 2. confide 3. comport) with the strictest legal limitations.
- 3 "There's a risk of a race to the bottom here," says Vivek Krishnamurthy, assistant director of Harvard Law School's Cyberlaw Clinic, who specializes in international Internet governance. "Anything that's mildly controversial is probably illegal in some authoritarian country. So we could [65](1. come 2. end 3. put) up with a really sanitized Internet, where all that's left is cute cat photos."
- 4 Not that there's [66](1. everything 2. anything 3. nothing) wrong with an Internet filled with cute cat photos — as long as there is space for healthy, vibrant, controversial discourse, too. If the national laws and [67](1. economies 2. mores 3. languages) of two different places are in direct opposition, the risk is that discourse in the less strict nation will be limited by the rules of the stricter place. In the worst case scenario, entire events could be wiped from the online record.
- 5 One prime example of this is the recent concept and controversy being discussed in Europe about the "right to be forgotten", which stems from the desire of individuals to [68](1. selectively 2. profusely 3. indiscriminately) remove parts of their online history — including information, media,

or other records — from Internet search engines such that others could not track and locate this information after a certain amount of time has passed. Essentially, it is a way of [69](1. brushing 2. cleaning 3. polishing) the slate and allowing people to not be judged professionally, personally, or otherwise based on their past actions.

6 “[70](1. As follows 2. On the contrary 3. For example), while Europeans might feel comfortable with having a right to be forgotten, Latin Americans — who are just now starting to read the worst pages of their recent history, trying to find out what really happened in their military dictatorships — don’t want to give dictators and their allies the right to delete what they did from the Internet,” says Gus Rossi, global policy director at the public interest group Public Knowledge. “Different people might have different expectations about the same issue. It’s not [71](1. ideal 2. impossible 3. impertinent) when one party decides for the other without taking that party’s views into account.”

7 Laws or court orders with a global reach could also [72](1. notoriously 2. unintentionally 3. domestically) create a global standard. Krishnamurthy points to a Canadian court ruling, which cited the European Court of Justice’s rationale on its “right to be forgotten” laws. And another court case in Hong Kong cites the Canadian case. The way this [73](1. speaks 2. storms 3. spirals) out of control is if companies adapt to the most restrictive regime when country after country continually one-ups each other.

8 This problem is made worse by the fact that individual court rulings are not designed to be tools for global Internet governance in the first place. Court rulings are [74](1. reactive 2. circumspect 3. collaborative) by nature, not the result of a discussion of all relevant parties involved. “Ideally, countries, users, and companies could sit at the same table and agree on how to govern freedom of expression online,” says Rossi. “[75](1. In stamping out 2. In absence of 3. In opposition to) such mechanisms, it would be best if countries at least restrained from passing global reach legislation or court orders.”

9 This idea of what some call a splinternet is all fairly new. “For a long time, the preferred response when content was illegal in one place was simply to geoblock it,” Krishnamurthy explains, with the practice going all the way back to 2000 when France and Germany were asking Yahoo to take down content and materials that paid [76](1. homage 2. notice 3. dividends) to Nazism. Eventually, the company came to the solution of banning content on a country by country basis, blocking content based on a user’s IP address.

10 But this was not satisfactory for a couple of reasons. First, IP-based blocking is only about 95 percent effective, Krishnamurthy says, meaning there were still some people in those countries who

were able to access the offending material. And there was also a universalizing claim that was put [77](1. aside 2. down 3. forward) by the French in particular. “The claim was ‘hey, everyone enjoys the right to privacy,’” Krishnamurthy says, “and if someone in the US gets to see this material that we in France say violates the rights of a Frenchman, then that Frenchman isn’t getting to enjoy his full rights.” But while [78](1. reducing 2. executing 3. contributing) global policy based on a local court ruling clearly isn’t the ideal, a splintering of the Internet — where what you see depends on the cultural differences across national borders — would also be disagreeable, or downright dystopian.

11 Part of the problem is that only a handful of American tech companies control so much of what we see online, and there is still no [79](1. corrupt 2. imperative 3. centralized) forum for Internet governance. There are a few international groups, such as the United Nations’ International Telecommunication Union, the Internet Governance Forum, and the Freedom Online Coalition, but none of these have real power to establish a global standard recognized by all. “These issues are up to the companies and the governments themselves,” says Cynthia Wong, a senior Internet researcher at the nonprofit Human Rights Watch.

12 At [80](1. least 2. length 3. first) for right now, the tenuous relationships between companies and governments, advertisers, and users are keeping free speech alive. “The genie is staying in the bottle in part because these players face multiple kinds of pressures,” says Krishnamurthy. Advertisers now balk at the idea of inadvertently funding hate speech. Users can leave a platform if its policies get too burdensome. These recent court rulings act as mere patches while the bigger question of what the global Internet should look like is worked out by its stakeholders.

13 “The way the trend is going, there is a lot of pressure directed at breaking the Internet, this global network, into a national network with interconnections,” says Krishnamurthy. “It could change what the Internet looks like in five or ten years. If Internet users, tech companies, governments, and advertisers want to keep that from happening, now’s the time to come together and conceive a plan.

—Based on Alba, D. (2017). “The world may be headed for a fragmented ‘splinternet,’” *Wired*.

[81] According to the article, which of the following is becoming a problem for the Internet?

1. Google cannot easily eliminate search results for counterfeit products.
2. It is too easy to establish platforms for promoting hate speech online.
3. The rules about what is permissible content are different for each country.
4. The popularity of cat photos has made it difficult for other content to survive.

[82] What can be inferred from the country-specific rulings against Facebook, Google, and other social media sites?

1. They are all the result of the “right to be forgotten”.
2. The results in one country can have a wide effect.
3. Geoblocking is working well for most countries.
4. A \$57 million fine is too little to deter most companies.

[83] Which of these is an example of a “race to the bottom,” as used in the 3rd paragraph?

1. The government slightly increasing the minimum wage to meet the citizens’ needs.
2. A company lowering their operating costs to increase customer satisfaction.
3. Online services offering temporary free memberships to maximize user growth.
4. A country lowering testing standards to increase the scores of the worst students.

[84] According to the article, what is a problem with allowing each country to set its own standards on Internet content?

1. There will be too much trivial content on the Internet.
2. Such standards are only about 95% effective.
3. The strictest local rules tend to become global standards.
4. The Internet will become a forum for arguments.

[85] Which of the following best describes “the right to be forgotten”?

1. The right to have one’s online information blocked from search results.
2. The right to delete all records of one’s personal identifying information.
3. The right to use an alias on social networking websites and services.
4. The right of consumers to opt out of targeted advertising.

[86] In the 9th paragraph, what does the term “geoblock” refer to?

1. Using a firewall to filter out illegal or offensive content and services.
2. Deleting content that refers to Nazism from online services.
3. Preventing a user from posting on social media and message boards.
4. Denying access to online information depending on the user’s country.

[87] In the 11th paragraph, what is true about the United Nations' International Telecommunication Union and the other groups mentioned?

1. They have the power to set international regulations for the Internet.
2. They have limited ability to decide on standards for the Internet.
3. They are among the international companies that control Internet content.
4. They work with concerned parties to solve Internet-related issues.

[88] According to the article, which of the following is NOT a factor that is preserving free speech on the Internet?

1. Advertisers usually don't do business with groups that spread hate speech.
2. There are existing functional relationships between the various stakeholders.
3. Users can easily move to another service if they disagree with a service's policies.
4. There are laws in place designed to provide long-lasting solutions.

[89] In the 12th paragraph, why does the author write "the genie is staying in the bottle"?

1. The Internet will remain the same for the time being, but this could change.
2. The Internet cannot change for now due to new, restrictive regulations.
3. None of the concerned groups involved have any interest in changing the Internet.
4. The changes being made to the Internet are unfortunate, but necessary.

[90] According to Vivek Krishnamurthy, what might happen in the next decade?

1. There will be clear international standards for communication on the Internet.
2. Internet users will decide what kind of content is appropriate for themselves.
3. Companies, advertisers, and governments will cooperate to create new policies.
4. Countries will create their own limited networks with some links between them.